

Dear Mr. Blundell,

Enclosed I have pleasure in sending to you a pamphlet, written by Morgan Harris from Culvercity California.

Though I enjoy reading L&L, I don't think that its influence on public affairs is of any importance. The same is valid for Grondvest, after ten years its number of favourers amounts about 250. The editor of Recht en Vrijheid announces in the november issue that the number of members has increased in 1980 by ten and now amounts to 90 - after fifty years of propaganda. And as far as I am informed, bigger groups exists nowhere in the world. The movement in Holland runs about 100 years. In my opinion there must be something wrong in the presentation of our cause and in our tactics, just as Morgan Harris maintains. Apart from dutch affairs - I keep these internal - I like to say a few words about our international movement.

Rent embodies so many items, it reflects buildings, roads, sewers, water, gas, etc, the unlooker cannot see the fish for the crowd round the barrow, as "Open Sesame" item 20 says. In the film "For the land is Mine" rent is determined as the difference between its maximum potential productivity and that of less productive land actual in use. (unquote) This rent is natural rent. In the cities and villages natural rent is constantly developping into cultural rent. You may call these economic rents, but in reality only these rents are due to the community. In the past I urged english friends to coin an artificial word to distinguish that kind of rent from every other kind of rent. I proposed to name it:

comrent = community rent

cocrent = communal created rent

but now I propose simply xrent.

and to accept also its derivations as: to collect xrent, xrent-payer, xrent-office, exchequer of xrents, zero-xrent for bare land, and so on. The target of collecting xrent is to open access to land for everyone, it forges idle land into use and prevent everyone to keep land idle for speculation.

Xrent principally differs from any other kind of rent. Rent-on-leasehold is a compulsory sum of money, claimed on the ownership of land and that rent surpasses economic rents to a high degree in cities and villages. Our target is to destroy land-monopoly and the only means by which it can be done is "collecting of xrent". Our policy should be to direct our attack against the weakest positions, not the strongest. The weakest positions are in the country, where land is cheap and/or idle and where people understand and in the open plots of the cities. The film says: "no man should be allowed to hold idle land without payment to the state". The strongest positions are in the cities where taxation of land- and site-values is almost impossible on account of the heavy resistance of the vested interest.

Taxation of land-values doesn't do any harm to monopoly, it will only increase government's income and will enormously enlarge the expressive power of the state. And that frightens me!

Landlordism causes a maximum restriction of productive activities - England over two million of unemployed - while collecting of xrent would incite the whole society to its maximum production.

Now, please think the matter over. I should appreciate very much if you would - wholly or partly - publish this letter in Land & Liberty.

I am prepared to comment on every reaction by your readers.

Take Harris' message to heart and try to persuade your readers by a fresh tackle to take part in the propaganda and developpe new activities.

Sincery yours

Wim Born

since 1930 active for our cause.